UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN NORTHERN DIVISION

EVERETT COX #235218,		
Plaintiff,		
V.		File No. 2:08-CV-176
		HON. ROBERT HOLMES BELL
UNKNOWN FLUERY, et al.,		
Defendants.		
	/	

ORDER APPROVING AND ADOPTING MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

On August 3, 2009, United States Magistrate Judge Timothy P. Greeley issued a report and recommendation ("R&R") recommending that Defendants' motions for summary judgment (Dkt. Nos. 51, 74) be granted, that Plaintiff's request for a transfer (Dkt. No. 81) be denied, and that this case be dismissed in its entirety. (Dkt. No. 88, R&R.) The R&R was duly served on the parties. Plaintiff was granted an extension of time to file objections. (Dkt. No. 92, 08/20/2009 Order.) Plaintiff filed objections to the report and recommendation on August 31, 2009. (Dkt. No. 93.)

This Court is required to make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the R&R to which objection has been made, and may accept, reject, or modify any or all of the Magistrate Judge's findings or recommendations. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b).

Plaintiff objects to the Magistrate Judge's conclusions by reasserting the same

arguments he raised in response to Defendants' motions for summary judgment. Upon de

novo review, the Court finds that each of the arguments raised in Plaintiff's objections has

already been addressed in the R&R. Because the Court agrees with the analysis and the

conclusions in the R&R, and because Plaintiff has raised no new issues that have not already

been addressed in the R&R, the Court denies Plaintiff's objections for the reasons stated in

the R&R. Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the August 3, 2009, R&R (Dkt. No. 88) is

APPROVED and **ADOPTED** as the opinion of the Court.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Defendants' motions for summary judgment (Dkt.

Nos. 51, 74) are **GRANTED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff's request for a transfer (Dkt. No. 81) is

DENIED.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that JUDGMENT is entered in favor of all

Defendants and Plaintiff's complaint is **DISMISSED** in its entirety.

IT IS FURTHER CERTIFIED pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3) and Fed. R. App.

P. 24(a)(3) that an appeal of this action would not be in good faith.

Dated: September 16, 2009

/s/ Robert Holmes Bell

ROBERT HOLMES BELL

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

2